Page 1 of 3

14

16

18

20

22

24 25

26 27

28

Warehouse Union, Local 29 (Local 29), through respective counsel, hereby submit the following:

Defendants ILWU and Local 29 believe that there is confusion between the Order and the discussion with the court at the telephonic ENE conference held on August 11, 2008. It was the understanding of defendants' counsel that the court would hold another ENE conference and that discovery would not commence until the following matters were addressed:

- 1) Magistrate Judge Majors indicated at the August 11 conference that the court needed to determine whether the Magistrate Judge should recuse herself in the event that review of court records indicated that the Magistrate Judge was involved, through the U.S. attorneys office at that time, in the underlying criminal matter of U.S. v. Rodriguez, Case No. 3:94-cr-00099-T. Defendants submit that plaintiff's conviction in that case legally precludes him from holding union office under 29 U.S.C. 504, and bars plaintiff's instant civil action seeking damages for "wrongful" removal from union office. The parties have not yet received notice as to the status of the review as to possible recusal.
- 2) At the August 11 conference Plaintiff was ordered to meet and confer with defense counsel regarding his intent to file an amended complaint. Plaintiff counsel has not yet shared a draft amended complaint with defense counsel.
- 3) At the August 11 conference, defense counsel stated that 29 U.S.C. 504 requires the court to notify the U.S. Department of Labor for its possible participation in this action at least as to the section 504 issues. Defense counsel will send a letter to the Department of Labor giving such notice. Defendants believe and had understood that discovery would await possible intervention by the Department of Labor.

1	4) Consistent with this understanding, plaintiff counsel has not communicated with		
2	defense counsel regarding any Rule 26(f) Conference and none has yet been held.		
3	Accordingly, defendants request that the court clarify the status of the case in light of the		
5	above and extend the dates specified in the court's Order Following ENE, dated August 11, 2008.		
6	Datadi Santambar 2, 2009	LEO	ANDD CADDED LLD
7	Dated: September 2, 2008	LEOF	ANRD CARDER, LLP
8			
9		By:	/s/ Robert Remar
10			Robert Remar Attorneys for Defendant, INTERNATIONAL
11			LONGSHORE AND WAREHOUSE UNION
12	D . 1 G 1 2 2000	шог	
13	Dated: September 2, 2008	HOLO	GUIN, GARFIELD & MARTINEZ, LLP
14			
15		By:	/s/ John Kim
16 17		25.	John Kim Attorneys for Defendant, INTERNATIONAL
'' 18			LONGSHORE AND WAREHOUSE UNION,
19			LOCAL 29
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			